

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Replacement drawings are submitted for Figures 1, 3 and 4. Figure 2, which appears on the same page as Figures 3 and 4 is unamended.

REMARKS

Initially, applicant would like to thank Examiner Reynolds for granting an interview and for his time spent during the interview. Applicant would also like to thank Supervisory Patent Examiner Yu for attending the interview and for his input during the interview.

Formal Matters

The specification is amended to make editorial changes therein. Each instance of "sheet" is changed to "disc" consistent with what is shown in the Figures and with the disclosure of DVD, CDR and CD-RW. In addition, each instance of "crasing" is changed to "creasing" in the specification and to "fold line" in the claims. As pointed out at the interview, the above changes are believed not to introduce new matter.

Replacement drawings are submitted herewith for Figures 1, 3 and 4 removing the shading so as to improve the reproducibility and clarity of the drawings. The replacement drawings are believed sufficient to address the drawing objection noted in the Official Action and do not add new matter.

Claims 1-3 were previously pending in the application. New claims 4-6 are added. Therefore, claims 1-6 are presented for consideration.

Claims 1-3 are amended along the lines suggested in the Official Action to address the claim objections noted on page 3 of the Official Action.

As set forth at the interview, to address the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections, claims 1-3 are amended to remove indefinite terms including "for example", "such as" "or the like". The claims are further amended so as to avoid positively reciting the object to be held. The claims are further amended to define the recited directions and to distinguish between each of the "portions" and "fold lines" without relying on the reference characters. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

#### Substantive Matters

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by THIELE et al. DE 19728263. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended along the lines discussed at the interview to clarify that the double folds at the distal end of the inner envelope converge in a direction towards each other so as to present a first opening width, and during the continued opening of the package and up to a totally opened position the opening extends to a second opening width that is greater than the first opening width.

As pointed out at the interview, THIELE does not disclose such converging aspect of the double walls. Rather, THIELE uses a flap 12 to keep his CD in the outer envelope. In addition, it does not appear that THIELE changes the width of his opening. Moreover, THIELE fails to disclose that the open space is immediately adjacent to a triangular portion of the inner envelope, said triangular portion having a base parallel with the fold line of the outer envelope.

As the reference does not disclose that which is recited, the anticipation rejection is not viable.

The dependent claims are believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by KAIKKIS DE 19510090. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

As set for above, claim 1 is amended to recite that the double folds at the distal end of the inner envelope converge in a direction towards each other so as to present a first opening width, and during the continued opening of the package and up to a totally opened position the opening extends to a second opening width that is greater than the first opening width.

As pointed out at the interview, KAIKKIS does not disclose such converging aspect of the double walls. Rather, KAIKKIS uses a flap 16 to keep his CD in the outer envelope. In addition, it does not appear that THIELE changes the width of his

opening. Moreover, THIELE fails to disclose that the open space is immediately adjacent to a triangular portion of the inner envelope, said triangular portion having a base parallel with the fold line of the outer envelope.

As the reference does not disclose that which is recited, the anticipation rejection is not viable.

The dependent claims are believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

New claims 4-6 are added. Claim 4 includes features similar to that of claim 1 and the analysis above regarding claim 1 is equally applicable to claim 4. Claim 5 depends from claim 4 and includes features similar to claim 3. Support for claims 4 and 5 can be found at least in Figure 5 with respect to triangular portion 11.

Claim 6 is a combination claim that claims the package in combination with a disc. Claim 6 includes features similar to that of claim 1 and the analysis above regarding claim 1 is equally applicable to claim 6.

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Liam McDowell/

Liam McDowell, Reg. No. 44,231  
209 Madison Street, Suite 500  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573

LM/lrs

**APPENDIX:**

The Appendix includes the following item(s):  
replacement drawings for Figures 1, 3 and 4